



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/634,645	08/05/2003	Mauricio Rojas	60068.0002US01	7190
7590	07/15/2005			EXAMINER
TIM TINGKANG XIA MORRIS, MANNING & MARTIN, LLP 1600 ATLANTA FINANCIAL CENTER 3343 PEACHTREE ROAD, N.E. ATLANTA, GA 30326-1044			SWARTZ, RODNEY P	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1645	
DATE MAILED: 07/15/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/634,645	ROJAS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Rodney P. Swartz, Ph.D.	1645	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10May2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-88 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 17-88 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) 1-88 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicants' Response to Office Action, received 10May2005, is acknowledged. Claims 1 and 13 have been amended.

Claims 1-88 are pending. Claims 17-88 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention.

2. Claims 1-16 are under consideration.

Rejections Maintained

3. The rejection of claims 1-9 and 13 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-12 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,432,680 in view of WO 03/002598, is maintained for reasons of record.

Applicants argue that claims 1-12 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,432,680 teach an isolated fusion polypeptide comprising ≥ 8 consecutive residues of SEQ ID NO:1 and a target peptide or polypeptide that normally evidences *less than optimal permeability* through a cell membrane and thus there is no motivation to combine a polypeptide comprising ≥ 8 consecutive residues of SEQ ID NO:1 with an I_KB protein that *has optimal permeability* through a cell membrane.

The examiner has considered applicants' argument, but does not find it persuasive for the reasoning put forth in the original rejection. The addition into claims 1 and 13 of the phrase "that has optimal permeability through a cell membrane" constitutes new matter, *see below*.

4. The rejection of claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,248,558) in view of Crisanti (WO 03/002598) is maintained for reasons of record.

Applicants argue that claims 1-16 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,248,558 teach an isolated fusion polypeptide comprising ≥ 8 consecutive residues of SEQ ID NO:1 and a target peptide or polypeptide that normally evidences *less than optimal permeability* through a cell membrane and thus there is no motivation to combine a polypeptide comprising ≥ 8 consecutive residues of SEQ ID NO:1 with an I_KB protein that *has optimal permeability* through a cell membrane.

The examiner has considered applicants' argument, but does not find it persuasive for the reasoning put forth in the original rejection. The addition into claims 1 and 13 of the phrase "that has optimal permeability through a cell membrane" constitutes new matter, *see below*.

New Rejection Necessitated by Amendment

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Newly amended claims 1 and 13 now recite that the fusion protein has "optimal" permeability through a cell membrane.

Applicants' response to Office Action states that "Support for the amendment set forth above can be found in the disclosure as originally filed at least in claims 1-88 and the specification. Thus, no new matter is added."

However, a review of the specification and claims originally presented does not provide evidence for the addition of the term "optimal". Applicants are required to indicate by page number and line number the specific support for "optimal". Unless such evidence can be provided, removal of the new matter, i.e., "optimal", is required.

Conclusion

7. No claims are allowed.
8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).
Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

9. This application contains claims 17-88 drawn to a nonelected invention. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancellation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rodney P. Swartz, Ph.D., Art Unit 1645, whose telephone number is (571) 272-0865. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 5:30 AM to 4:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynette F. Smith, can be reached on (571)272-0864.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


RODNEY P SWARTZ, PH.D
PRIMARY EXAMINER
Art Unit 1645

July 11, 2005